



**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COLUMBIA DIVISION**

DIANA JORDAN, <div style="text-align: right;">Plaintiff,</div>	§ § § § § § §	Civil Action No. 3:20-03540-MGL
vs. RICHLAND COUNTY FAMILY COURT, <div style="text-align: right;">Defendant.</div>		

**ORDER ADOPTING THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION
AND DENYING PLAINTIFF’S MOTION TO PROCEED IN FORMA PAUPERIS**

Plaintiff Diana Jordan (Jordan), proceeding pro se, filed this action against the Richland County Family Court for allegedly providing a sealed family court case to probate court. Jordan is a frequent filer of lawsuits in this Court, having filed at least twenty-four lawsuits in 2018–2019. In 2020, Jordan filed six lawsuits.

The matter is before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (Report) of the United States Magistrate Judge suggesting Jordan’s motion to proceed in forma pauperis be denied. The Report was made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636 and Local Civil Rule 73.02 for the District of South Carolina.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to the Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight. The responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270 (1976). The Court is charged with making a de novo determination of those portions of the Report to which a specific objection is made, and the Court

may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). The Court need not conduct a de novo review, however, “when a party makes general and conclusory objections that do not direct the court to a specific error in the [Magistrate Judge’s] proposed findings and recommendations.” *Orpiano v. Johnson*, 687 F.2d 44, 47 (4th Cir. 1982); *see* Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b).

The Magistrate Judge filed the Report on October 9, 2020. The Clerk of Court docketed Jordan’s objections to the Report on October 23, 2020. The Court has reviewed the objections, but holds them to be without merit. It will therefore enter judgment accordingly.

Here, Jordan has wholly failed to bring any specific objections to the Report. Instead, she merely makes arguments the Magistrate Judge has already considered and rejected. Inasmuch as the Court agrees with the Magistrate Judge’s treatment of those issues, it need not repeat the discussion here. Consequently, because Jordan neglects to make any specific objections, and the Court has found no clear error, it need not make a de novo review of the record before overruling Jordan’s objections and accepting the Magistrate Judge’s recommendation.

After a thorough review of the Report and the record in this case pursuant to the standard set forth above, the Court overrules Jordan’s objections, adopts the Report, and incorporates it herein. Therefore, it is the judgment of the Court Jordan’s motion to proceed in forma pauperis is **DENIED**. Jordan shall have until Thursday, August 5, 2021, to pay the full filing fee in this matter (\$402). Failure to pay the filing fee by August 5, 2021, will result in the dismissal of this matter without prejudice.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Signed this 22nd day of July 2021, in Columbia, South Carolina.

s/ Mary Geiger Lewis
MARY GEIGER LEWIS
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL

The parties are hereby notified of the right to appeal this Order within thirty days from the date hereof, pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.